

REMARKS

Claim 22 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 11, 13, 20 and 24 have been amended.

Claims 1-21 and 23-24 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

1. The title has been amended.
2. Replacement drawings are enclosed herewith amending FIG. 1.
3. The figures have been amended.
4. Claims 13-19 and 24 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for alleging failing to enable the claimed invention.

Claim 13 has been amended to properly depend from claim 11. Claim 24 has been amended to properly depend from claim 20.

5. Claim 6 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter deemed to be the present invention.

Claim 6 has been amended.

6. Claims 1, 5, and 6 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by the subject matter recited in U.S. Patent 3,755,618 to Poppy (hereinafter “Poppy”).

As amended, claim 1 recites a television receiver that includes:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal;

a selective filter stage that receives said received signal and provides a filtered signal;

an intermediate-frequency stage that receives said filtered signal and bandshifts said filtered signal to provide an IF signal; and” (emphasis added, cl. 1)

The IF stage in Poppy does not receive a filtered signal from a selective filter stage as recited in claim 1. The Official Action construes the dashed block 21 shown in FIG. 1 of Poppy as the selective filter (see Official Action, pg. 4). However, the dashed block 21 of Poppy does not provide a filtered signal to the IF amplifier 12 shown in FIG. 1 of Poppy. Specifically, a fair and proper reading of Poppy fails to reveal *“an intermediate-frequency stage that receives said filtered signal”* since the IF amplifier stage 12 in Poppy only receives a signal from the tuner 11. A 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection requires that a single reference teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Poppy is incapable of anticipating claim 1.

7. Claims 1-4 and 24 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by the subject matter recited in U.S. Patent 4,107,730 to Jones (hereinafter “Jones”).

As amended, claim 1 recites a television receiver that includes:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal;

a selective filter stage that receives said received signal and provides a filtered signal;

an intermediate-frequency stage that receives said filtered signal and bandshifts said filtered signal to provide an IF signal; and” (emphasis added, cl. 1)

The IF stage 12 in Jones does not receive a filtered signal from a selective filter stage as recited in claim 1. The Official Action construes elements 20-22 shown in FIG. 1 of Jones as the selective filter (see Official Action, pg. 5). However, elements 20-22 do not provide a filtered signal to the IF amplifier 12 shown in FIG. 1 of Jones. Specifically, a fair and proper reading of Jones fails to reveal “*an intermediate-frequency stage that receives said filtered signal*” since the IF stage 12 in Jones only receives a signal from the tuner 11. A 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection requires that a single reference teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Jones is incapable of anticipating claim 1.

Claim 24 has been amended to properly depend from claim 20, and therefore the patentability of claim 24 shall be discussed herein below in the context of independent claim 20.

8. Claims 1, 2, 7-13 and 18-23 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by the subject matter recited in U.S. Patent 6,473,134 to Nohara et al (hereinafter “Nohara”).

As amended, claim 1 recites a television receiver that includes:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal;

 a selective filter stage that receives said received signal and provides a filtered signal;

an intermediate-frequency stage that receives said filtered signal and bandshifts said filtered signal to provide an IF signal; and” (emphasis added, cl. 1)

The IF stage in Nohara does not receive a filtered signal from a selective filter stage as recited in claim 1. The Official Action construes the video signal stabilizing means 8 shown in FIG. 1 of Nohara as the selective filter (see Official Action, pg. 6). However, the video signal stabilizing

means 8 of Nohara DOES NOT provide a filtered signal to an intermediate stage, since a fair and proper reading of Nohara reveals that the receiving means 2 of Nohara generates the IF signal. Specifically, Nohara states: *“[i]n the receiving means 2, a video signal and an audio signal are detected from a television signal, and, for example, an IF signal is generated as a control signal for detecting electric field information.”* (emphasis added, col. 12, lines 2-5). Accordingly, a fair and proper reading of Nohara fails to reveal “*an intermediate-frequency stage that receives said filtered signal*” (cl. 1). A 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection requires that a single reference teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Nohara is incapable of anticipating claim 1.

Claim 11 recites a television receiver comprising:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal indicative thereof;

a first selective filter stage that receives and filters said received signal to provide a filtered signal, wherein said selective filter stage implements a transfer function that is modifiable by one or more control signals derived from a field strength signal; and

an intermediate-frequency stage that receives and processes a signal indicative of said filtered signal to provide an IF signal and generates a first control signal of said one or more control signals.” (emphasis added, cl. 11)

As set forth above with respect to claim 1, a fair and proper reading of Nohara reveals that this prior art reference does not disclose “*an intermediate-frequency stage that receives and processes a signal indicative of said filtered signal to provide an IF signal...*” (cl. 11). In fact, Nohara reveals that the IF stage is in the receiving means 2 (see FIG. 1 and col. 12, lines 2-5), which is upstream of the alleged selective filter, which the Official Action construes as video signal stabilizing means 8. In contrast, the invention set forth in claim 11 has the intermediate-

frequency stage downstream of the selective filter stage. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Nohara is incapable of anticipating claim 11.

Claim 20 recites a television receiver that includes:

A television receiver comprising:

“a tuner that receives a transmitted signal from an antenna and provides a received signal indicative thereof;

first selective filter means, responsive to said received signal, for implementing a transfer function modifiable in response to one or more control signals and filtering said received signal to provide a filtered signal; and

means for generating said control signal derived from a detected field strength of the received signal, and for bandshifting said filtered signal to provide an IF signal.” (emphasis added, cl. 20).

A fair and proper reading of Nohara reveals that this prior art reference does not disclose “means, ..., for bandshifting said filtered signal to provide and IF signal” (cl. 20). In fact, Nohara reveals that the IF stage is in the receiving means 2 (see FIG. 1 and col. 12, lines 2-5), which is upstream of the alleged selective filter, which the Official Action construes as video signal stabilizing means 8. In contrast, the invention set forth in claim 20 has the intermediate-frequency stage downstream of the selective filter stage. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Nohara is incapable of anticipating claim 20.

9. Claims 14, 15 and 17 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Nohara in view of Jones.

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since claim 11 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

10. Claim 16 currently stands rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Nohara in view of Poppy.

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot since claim 11 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-21 and 23-24 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


Patrick J. O'Shea
Reg. No. 35,305
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.
1500 Main Street, Suite 912
Springfield, MA 01115
(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102